

November 4, 2004

## MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee (CPC)

From: Christine Taylor Thompson, Planning Associate  
University Planning

Subject: **Record of the November 2, 2004 CPC meeting**

Attending: Carole Daly (Chair), Janna Alley, Rich Linton, Colin McArthur, Randall McGowan, Gordon Melby, Steve Pickett, Andrzej Proskurowski, Chris Ramey, Robert Ribe, Greg Stripp

Guests: Bob Beals (Athletics), Jen DeVries (PARS), Allen Gidley (Housing), Larry Gilbert (CMGS), Tim King (Facilities Services), Dennis Munroe (PARS), Fred Tepfer (University Planning)

Staff: Christine Thompson (University Planning)

**Agenda:** 1. **Tennis Courts Replacement and Athletic Fields Improvements Project - Schematic Design**  
2. **Hayward Plaza - Redesign**

### 1. **Tennis Courts Replacement and Athletic Fields Improvements Project - Schematic Design**

Background: Staff summarized the related LRCDP patterns and policies contained in the meeting mailing.

Fred Tepfer, University Planning Office, introduced the Tennis Courts Replacement and Athletic Fields Improvements Project. Many sites were studied before selecting the proposed site east of Howe Field. Although the proposed site will cost more to

develop than other alternatives, it clearly provides the greatest benefit to Athletics, PARS, and the campus as a whole. An East Campus location was seriously considered, but it was rejected because it is too far from the Student Tennis Facility, it would inefficiently use land that has future development potential, and it would still be relatively expensive to develop.

Dennis Munroe, PARS, said the proposed solution will place the tennis courts in an ideal location adjacent to the Student Tennis Center as well as substantially improve current Athletics and PARS facilities. This joint effort between Housing, PARS, and Athletics will replace the two clay-based intramural fields, which are often closed due to excessive wear and inclement weather, with higher quality, sand-based fields. This will substantially increase field use. The existing warm-up track will be replaced with a preferred 400-meter track providing a better venue for athletes preparing for competition as well as for recreational users.

Larry Gilbert of CMGS Landscape Architects presented the proposed design as shown in the drawings contained in the meeting mailing. He defined the project site, clarifying that a majority of the straightaway portion of the practice track and the existing west embankment and pathway adjacent to Howe Field will not be impacted. In addition, the 6-foot chain-link fence along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be retained due to budget limitations. The topography of the project area will be transformed into two primary terraces with retaining walls where necessary to provide a flat site for the tennis courts, fields, and running track. The retaining wall will be a maximum of approximately six-feet at the southwest corner along 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue and will be landscaped.

The tennis court alignment will match the interior courts and be surrounded by a 10-foot chain-link fence with a windscreen similar to the previous outdoor courts. Three- or four-seat tiered bleachers will be located between the courts inside the facility. This is the preferred location for viewing tennis matches. The new storage building, which will incorporate restrooms and a drinking fountain, is not yet designed, but it will be a pre-manufactured, one-story building.

The existing service drive will be moved slightly east and paved to provide access to the relocated outdoor storage area and to Hayward Field. The only service access to the tennis courts will be via a grass embankment that allows mowers but restricts other vehicles. A second storage building with a drinking fountain is proposed for the outdoor storage area if funds are available.

The new fields will be surrounded 4-foot chain-link fencing and 15-foot nets at each end.

No lighting is proposed as this time although conduit will be pre-installed to accommodate future lighting, which would be subject to review.

Discussion: In response to a member's question, Larry said although a fire lane is not required, the new service drive will meet the minimum width requirement (14 feet) and be built to accommodate heavy dump trucks.

A member expressed concern about people attempting to sit on the high retaining wall to watch tennis. Larry said the high walls will be more like a steep embankment covered with landscape materials thus discouraging such activity. A guest added that the courts would not be visible from the retaining wall due to the opaque windscreens. Larry said Athletics has long-term plans to build an additional tennis support building in

the center of the courts to allow viewing from an upper level. Another member added that interior seating is not inviting to casual observers who may want to watch for a short time and are too intimidated to enter the gated area.

A member asked whether it would be possible to screen only three sides, similar to the previous courts, so that at least one side would be open (likely the west side). The intent would be to promote an open and inviting environment and, in particular, to provide a way for casual spectators to watch tennis without entering the gated area. Bob Beals, Athletics, said the intent is not to keep people out--spectators are encouraged--but the most important factor is to accommodate the players' needs. If wind is not a problem then one side can be left open.

A member suggested designing the west retaining wall and associated landscaping to accommodate spectator viewing. Tim King, Facilities Services, added that this area has been in need of attention, so it may be possible to improve it and plant trees. This may also help alleviate wind problems. Larry said future Howe Field improvements may also provide opportunities to enhance this area.

A member said it is important to provide a clear, accessible path connection from the existing path along the existing PARS fields to the new tennis courts. Fred said disabled individuals will have to use a portion of the running track, which should not be a problem as long as it is clear where individuals are supposed to go.

In response to a member's question Larry explained that the tennis courts were located as far west as possible to provide room on the east side for a visual and sound barrier (hedge) between the courts and playing field. A member noted that the resulting tight configuration on the west side may cause track users to "shy away" from the inside track due the close proximity of the tennis court fence. Larry said the site plan was designed to accommodate all required uses in a very restricted area.

In response to a member's question, Larry said the new 4-foot fencing will not be the higher quality rail design due to budget limitations. The member said chain-link fencing is generally not a campus standard and it should only be used for the 10-foot fencing. All other new fencing should be the panel rail design to match existing 4-foot and 6-foot fencing in the adjacent areas. Fred said this joint project will result in many improvements to the area beyond the tennis court replacement requirement, but a limited budget cannot fund all desired improvements.

A member said the proposed building designs require further review.

A member asked how the tennis-court facility would be managed to address potential safety concerns during the evening hours. Larry said existing adjacent lighting will provide ambient light during the evening hours to alleviate safety concerns, but it is not intended to provide light levels necessary for nighttime use. Bob said Athletics would prefer to lock the facility when it is not in use. Dennis said it is important to provide access for the casual recreational tennis player. Both agreed that the facility could be locked during dark evening hours to address safety concerns.

Action: The committee unanimously agreed that the schematic design for the Tennis Courts Replacement and Athletic Fields Improvements Project is consistent with the Long Range Campus Development Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Provide a clear, accessible path connection from the existing path along the existing PARS fields to the new tennis courts.
2. Install windscreens on only three sides of the tennis courts, similar to the previous courts, if possible to do so without disrupting the players' needs. The intent is to promote an open and inviting environment and, in particular, to provide a way for casual spectators to watch tennis without entering the gated area.
3. Ensure that no advertising is incorporated into the windscreens or mounted on the fences. Any proposed signage must comply with the Campus outdoor Sign Plan.
4. Research options to incorporate informal seating into the west retaining wall adjacent to the tennis courts to accommodate casual spectators.
5. Make every effort to use panel rail fencing in the project area to match existing 4-foot and 6-foot fencing in the adjacent areas. This excludes the 10-foot fencing surrounding the tennis courts.
6. Prepare designs for the two proposed buildings and bring them before the Design Review Subcommittee for review.
7. Ensure that the tennis-court facility safety concerns are addressed.

## **2. Hayward Plaza - Redesign**

Background: Staff summarized the related LRCDP patterns and policies contained in the meeting mailing. She clarified that only proposed changes to the previously approved design are subject to committee review.

Larry Gilbert of CMGS Landscape Architects presented the proposed changes to the design as shown in the drawings contained in the meeting mailing.

The original plaza columns and signage will be replaced with two seating-wall planters. The University of Oregon and Hayward signage will be integrated into the previously approved metal-gate entry design. The plaza pavers will be replaced with stamped concrete. In addition, the 15th Avenue entry columns will be replaced either with a tree and bollards or a standard campus light fixture.

Discussion: A member expressed support for installing campus light fixtures to mark the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue entries for three reasons:

- it will be easier to install the original column design in the future if funds become available (trees will not have to be removed),
- lights make better entry markers (bollards are used on campus to mark where autos should not go), and
- the light source is located where it is desirable (up high and projecting downward).

Another member suggested keeping the original entry columns as an alternate because it might still be possible to obtain funding if the bid process goes well.

Larry indicated support for the bollard entry alternative because a single light post with plantings is a rather weak entry feature.

In response to a member's question, Larry said the plaza gates can swing in both directions and will remain open except during events. He confirmed that they are designed to swing inwards when open so they do not block the proposed University of Oregon signage mounted on the gate.

A member stated her preference for the new design because it is reminiscent of the Dads' Gates and the revised Hayward signage is nicely integrated into the gate's ironwork. She expressed concern about the relative heaviness of the signage, however, when compared to the details of the gate. Larry said the drawing makes the sign appear heavier than intended and confirmed that it will be lighter in scale to match the character of the gate.

Another member indicated his preference for the revised plaza design, in particular removing the originally proposed columns. He also supported installing light posts to mark the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue entry.

A member noted that individual features of the plaza may not seem important, but as they are removed one by one, eventually the special quality is lost. For this reason, he supports maintaining the originally proposed pavers if at all possible.

Action: The committee unanimously agreed that the revised schematic design *of the plaza portion* the Hayward Plaza Project is consistent with the Long Range Campus Development Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved subject to the following condition:

The originally proposed pavers will be retained if at all possible.

Furthermore, the committee unanimously agreed that *the revised design option to install campus standard light fixtures at the 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue entry* as part of the Hayward Plaza Project is consistent with the Long Range Campus Development Plan and recommended to the president that it be approved.

Finally, the committee unanimously recommended that if project costs are partially funded by parking fund monies, funds should be directed towards improvements that most benefit the general campus community, for example the originally proposed 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue columns.

Please contact this office if you have questions.

cc. Bob Beals, Athletics  
Sebastian Collet, Student  
Jen DeVries, PARS

Mike Eyster, Housing  
Allen Gidley, Housing  
Larry Gilbert, CMGS  
Philip Hart, Student  
Tom Hicks, DPS  
Tim King, Facilities Services  
Bethany Larson, Student  
Colin McArthur, Student  
Steve McBride, Athletics  
Dennis Munroe, PARS  
Steve Nystrom, Eugene Planning  
Peg Peters, South University Neighbors  
Nels Schyllander, Athletics  
Rand Stamm, DPS  
Fred Tepfer, University Planning  
Lew Williams, Foundation  
Nancy Wright, Housing